

APPENDIX

- Stadium Task Force Meeting Notes, October 8, 2008
- Stadium Task Force Meeting Notes, October 24, 2008
- Stadium Task Force Meeting Notes, November 24, 2008
- Stadium Task Force Meeting Notes, December 18, 2008
- Stadium Task Force Meeting Notes, January 16, 2009

**Stadium Delivery Task Force
Meeting Notes
October 8, 2009**

Attendees: Darlene Septelka, Rodger Benson, Van Collins, Norm Strong, Dennis Greenlee., Ed Kommers, John Palewicz, and Dave Johnson.

1. The legislature's charge to this task force is to evaluate this procurement model (pros and cons) and discuss whether this model should be more widely used by other public agencies. To that end, Darlene Septelka has agreed, with assistance from John Palewicz, to compile the first draft of characteristics of this procurement method for further discussion at our next meeting October 24th, 10:00 a.m. to noon. The plan is to have a report to legislature by February 2009. The report would include a description of procurement model characteristics and discussion of pros and cons of these characteristics.
2. Highlights and Observations Discussion
 - All agreed that given time constraints and unique of husky stadium project, there are no objections to the use of this model to this project. Labor has requested that the project consider use of an apprenticeship program
 - It was noted that the procurement model looks very similar to those used in 63-20 projects (for clarification: the husky stadium project is not a 63-20, and does not include any requirements for financing or land transactions in the developer's scope of work).
 - Those with concerns and opposition to procurement models used in 63-20 are the same for this model. These concerns are that, for projects funded with public monies, contractors and subcontractors want access to the work: opportunity to bid. The perception is that developer models narrow the pool of bidders substantially. There is also a concern that transparency of process and accountability are compromised in these models.

Prepared by Olivia Yang

Stadium Delivery Task Force Meeting Notes October 24, 2008

Attendees: Darlene Septelka, Rodger Benson, Van Collins, Norman Strong, Dennis Greenlee, Ed Kommers, John Palewicz, and Dave Johnson

Darlene prepared first drafts of the flow chart and characteristics for this method, based on her reading of the Husky Stadium RFP. UW has requested to review and comment on Darlene's draft.

After discussion, it was agreed on the following format for the report, with the following authors assigned)

1. What is this method?	
1.1	Process flowchart (first draft completed/UW, all review)
1.2	Characteristics (first draft completed/UW, all review)
1.3	Comparison to other (GCCM, DB, DBB, 63-20) (Darlene Septelka)
1.4	Pros and cons of method
	For Designer (Norman Strong)
	For Builder
	General (Van Collins/Rodger Benson)
	Subcontractors (Ed Kommers/Larry Stevens)
	Labor (Dave Johnson)
	For Owner (Olivia Yang/Darlene Septelka)
	For "General Good" (all)
2. When to use: thresholds (Dennis Greenlee)	
3. Conclusions	
3.1	"yes/no/conditions"
3.2	How could other existing procurement be modified to meet this need, so that this is not required

Next meeting is December 18; all agreed that the November meeting is. Olivia will try to find a meeting date.

Prepared by Olivia Yang

**Stadium Delivery Task Force
Meeting Notes
November 24, 2008**

Attendees: Van Collins, Larry Stevens, Dennis Greenlee, Darlene Septelka, Rodger Benson, Norman Strong, Dave Johnson, and Ed Kommers.

Here are the notes from the meeting November 24th. Please let me know if I miss-stated or left something out. Have a good Thanksgiving.

1. Material sent in/presented by task force members: Darlene (comparison of stadium delivery method to design bid build, alternative procurement and 63-20), Dennis (thresholds for use of stadium model) and individual stakeholder pros and cons.
2. All will review material, and develop pros and cons, from each stakeholders perspective, of stadium delivery compared to design-bid-build, alternative procurement and 63-20. Circulate to other members of task force by December 5th. Darlene has developed a spreadsheet format for this comparison (sent out end of day November 24th).

Olivia will gather up December 5th materials, as well as material presented November 24th and send to Searetha Kelly and Nancy Deakins for distribution and discussion at December 11th CPARB meeting.

3. During the meeting, all agreed on four distinguishing characteristics of the stadium delivery model: transfer of risk from owner to developer, need for/availability of specialized expertise (by developer team) not found in owner, elimination of current public works requirements to procurement of subcontract work, and speed of delivery.
4. Ed stated his concerns that this delivery method may allow greater potential for fraud, waste and abuse.
5. In discussion of thresholds (along with thresholds drafted by Dennis), Ed felt that public owner should demonstrate that benefit to the public is so great that it compensates for the cons of this delivery method.
6. Conclusions: discussion of possible modifications to design build, to allow for most of the benefits of stadium delivery model (streamline selection, as currently practiced, one-step selection) may be more viable to private sector concerns. Integrated project delivery was also discussed as possible alternative.

Prepared by Olivia Yang

**Stadium Delivery Task Force
Meeting Notes
December 18, 2008**

Attendees (conference call): Larry Stevens, Rodger Benson, Dave Johnson, Darlene Septelka, Norman Strong, Dennis Greenlee, and Olivia Yang

1. Discussion around what the conclusions of the task force report should say. All agreed that while the pros and cons of the different procurement methods could be different and based on each stakeholder's perspective, the task force conclusions should represent consensus of task force members.

2. Olivia offered to draft conclusion based on discussion.

DRAFT:

"Task Force recommends that the completed UW Husky Stadium project be used to develop information on how well the developer model would work.

Until such time, the Task Force recommends that the existing alternative procurement methods (Design Build and GC/CM) be evaluated for ways they could be streamlined or changed (including borrowing components from one, for use in the other). There should also be discussion on the Integrated Project Delivery method, which is now becoming more widely used by private owners.

The Task Force also recommends that information about similar developer, or other three-part agreement projects in other states or by private owners, be gathered, to further inform the above discussion and evaluation.

3. All agreed to comment on the draft conclusion above. Olivia will be on vacation beginning December 22, 2008 until January 2, 2009. Olivia will gather comments to draft as a basis of the report back to CPARB.
4. Olivia will ask Kathleen to schedule another meeting in January, 2009, to complete the Task Force report. Target submittal time is February, 2009. Everyone is encouraged to complete their respective sections, and to review the other sections for comments or edits.

Thanks all, Happy Holidays!

Prepared by Olivia Yang

**Stadium Delivery Task Force
Meeting Notes
January 16, 2009**

Attendee: Larry Stevens, Rodger Benson, Darlene Septelka, Norman Strong, Dennis Greenlee, and Olivia Yang.

Unavailable: Dave Johnson

The purpose of the meeting was to prepare for a presentation to CPARB, February 12, 2009 and to finalize the report.

Action

1. All agreed that each stakeholder representative will speak about the stadium delivery method, from their perspective; send bullet points to Olivia by January 23, 2009 for incorporation into PowerPoint presentation. Ed completed his during the meeting. Rodger, Dennis and Van will discuss and turn something in as a joint "General Contractor" perspective. Olivia will call Dave.
2. Olivia will draft the executive summary for task force review.

Discussion

Ed proposed that we act proactively on the issue of flexibility in construction procurement and that CPARB support a new task force to look at Integrated Project Delivery (which is one of the recommendations of the task force). All were in support and will be proposed to CPARB during the February 12, 2009 Board meeting.

Prepared by Olivia Yang